

REMARKS

Applicants cancel claims 1-6 without prejudice. Claims 7-10 remain pending in the application. Applicants amend claims 7-10 for further clarification, and refer to Fig. 6 and its corresponding description—including page 12, line 9 to page 14, line 11—in the specification for exemplary embodiments of and support for the claimed invention. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,457,879 to Thurlow et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0046268 to Leong et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0193924 to Gehring et al.; claims 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thurlow et al. in view of Leong et al., Gehring et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,060 to Nixon et al.; and claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thurlow et al., Leong et al., Gehring et al., Nixon et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,455 to Fuisz. Applicants amend claims 7-10 in a good faith effort to further clarify the invention as distinguished from the cited references, and respectfully traverse the rejections thereof.

Again, Leong et al., as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, only include description of a network device being coupled to a number of end devices 34 and being viewed as an HTML server by clients 40. And Thurlow et al., as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, only include description of an email application program determining an online and offline state of its computer for connecting to a mail server and processing messages.

The Examiner cited and relied upon Gehring et al. as a further combining reference to specifically address polling features, which the Examiner acknowledged were absent from the disclosures of Leong et al. and Thurlow et al. Page 3, lines 6-10 of the Office Action.

And the Examiner cited Nixon et al. as a further combining reference to specifically address the claimed features in connection with editing communicability state information in an e-mail format, as recited in claim 3, which the Examiner acknowledged were absent from the disclosures of Leong et al., Thurlow et al., and Gehring et al. Page 4, lines 4-11 of the Office Action. The Examiner relied upon Nixon et al. as allegedly suggesting the claimed e-mail transferring features recited in claim 7. Page 5, lines 12-17 of the Office Action.

The Examiner cited Fuisz as a further combining reference to specifically address additional features recited in claims 9-10, which depend from claim 7. And Fuisz, as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, only includes description of a bounce process for routing e-mails using a bounce server or bounce processor.

Thus, none of the cited references, as relied upon by the Examiner, include any disclosure or suggestion of the claimed features with respect to an agent reception and transfer unit, which receives e-mail instead of a user of a terminal that is in an incommunicable state, deciding whether or not an email is to be received by it without receiving a whole of the email.

In other words, even assuming, arguendo, that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to combine Thurlow et al., Leong et al., Gehring et al., Nixon et al., and Fuisz, such a combination would still have failed to disclose or suggest,

“[a] router device used for a packet communication system accommodating one or more terminals and comprising an agent reception and transfer unit, which when at least one of said terminals is in an incommunicable state, receives e-mail instead of a user of a terminal that is in the incommunicable state and transfers the received e-mail to a desired transfer destination,

wherein the agent reception and transfer unit decides, without receiving a whole of the e-mail except for a title of the e-mail and an address of a transmission origin of the e-mail, whether or not the e-mail is to be received by the agent

reception and transfer unit,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7, together with claims 8-10 dependent therefrom, is patentable over Thurlow et al., Leong et al., Gehring et al., Nixon et al., and Fuisz, separately and in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dexter Chang/

Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-6384
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJ 17.715 (100794-11514)
DTC:tb